UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/022,056	12/12/2001	Paul N. Weinberg	05711.915	5658

36067 7590 07/08/2004

DALINA LAW GROUP, P.C.
7910 IVANHOE AVE. #325
LA JOLLA, CA 92037

EXAMINER	
CHOJNACKI, MELLISSA M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2175	7

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/022,056	Applicant(s) WEINBERG ET AL.	
	Examiner Mellissa M Chojnacki	Art Unit 2175	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-90 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-90 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The arrangement of the disclosed application does not conform with 37 CFR 1.77(b).

Section headings are underlined throughout the disclosed specification.

Section headings should not be underlined.

Appropriate corrections are required according to the guidelines provided below:

2. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

(a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
(b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
(c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
(d) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be submitted on compact discs.) or
REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)
(e) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
(1) Field of the Invention.
(2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
(f) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.

(g) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
(h) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
(i) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
(j) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
(k) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

3. The specification is objected to because of the following informalities:

In "Detailed Description of the Invention" section of the application, applicant is requested to supply the missing data or delete the blank lines on page 29 "(serial number: #######)".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 5-44 and 53-90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wotring et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,677) in view of Bliss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,999,938).

As to claim 1, Wotring et al. teaches a computer program product (See abstract; column 2, lines 49-51) comprising:

obtain a source data structure comprising a set of source tables (See column 2, lines 14-23), a set of source fields (See column 2, lines 54-60), a set of source records (See column 4, lines 10-15), a set of source table relationships (See column 2, lines 14-23), and a set of source values (See column 4, lines 35-44);

obtain transformation data comprising information associated with at least one of the set of source tables, the set of source fields, the set of source records, the set of source table relationships, and the set of source values (See column 1, lines 50-57; column 2, lines 14-23, lines 54-60; column 4, lines 10-15, lines 35-44; column 5, lines 39-45);

apply the transformation data to all or some of the set of source tables, the set of source fields, the set of source records, the set of source table relationships, or the set of source values (See column 1, lines 54-61; column 2, lines 14-23);

Wotring et al. does not teach a computer-usable medium having a computer program for transforming a source data structure to a destination data structure embodied therein, the computer program configured to: transform the source data structure into a destination data structure.

Bliss et al. teaches a system and method for creating a new data structure in memory populated with data from an existing data structure (See abstract), in which he teaches a computer-usable medium having a computer program for transforming a source data structure to a destination data structure embodied therein (See abstract; column 1, lines 14-18; column 3, lines 34-39), the computer program configured to:

transform the source data structure into a destination data structure (See abstract; column 29, lines 9-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Wotring et al., to include a computer-usable medium having a computer program for transforming a source data structure to a destination data structure embodied therein, the computer program configured to: transform the source data structure into a destination data structure.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Wotring et al., by the teachings of Bliss et al. because a computer-usable medium having a computer program for transforming a source data structure to a destination data structure embodied therein, the computer program configured to: transform the source data structure into a destination data structure would efficiently transform the data within the source data structure into formatted data within the field of the destination data structure thereby advantageously preserving the data within the destination data structure (See Bliss et al., column 5, lines 16-20).

As to claim 2, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the destination data structure comprises a database (See Wotring et al., abstract; column 1, lines 50-54, where "destination data structure" is read on "Hierarchical database"; column 2, lines 52-60).

As to claim 3, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the database comprises catalog data (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 4-7, where "catalog" is read on "indexing", also see lines 28-30).

As to claim 5, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data comprises mapping information and the computer program is configured to use the mapping information to execute a means for mapping the source data structure to the destination data structure (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 50-54; column 3, lines 21-22, lines 49-57; column 4, lines 10-16, where "source data structure" is read on "Relational Database" and "destination data structure" is read on "hierarchical database").

As to claim 6, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the mapping information is displayed to the user (See Bliss et al., column 15, lines 11-29; column 25, lines 30-34).

As to claim 7, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the mapping information comprises field-level mapping information that identifies a correlation between at least one of the set of source fields and at least one destination field (See (See Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14; column 25, lines 24-39).

As to claim 8, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the field-level mapping information is displayed to a user (See Bliss et al., column 15, lines 11-29; column 25, lines 30-34).

As to claim 9, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the at least one of the set of source fields in the field-level mapping comprises a source field combination having a plurality of source fields (See Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14, lines 30-36; column 25, lines 24-39).

As to claim 10, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the source field combinations are displayed to a user (See Bliss et al., column 19, lines 54-58).

As to claim 11, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the at least one destination field in the field-level mapping information comprises a destination field combination having a plurality of destination fields (See Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14; column 25, lines 24-39).

As to claims 12, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the destination field combinations are displayed to a user (See Bliss et al., column 21, lines 44-52).

As to claim 13, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the at least one of the set of source fields in the field-level mapping information comprises a source field

combination having a plurality of source fields and the at least one destination field in the field-level mapping comprises a destination field combination having a plurality of destination fields (See Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14, lines 30-36; column 25, lines 24-39).

As to claim 14, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the source field combinations and the destination field combinations are displayed to a user (See Bliss et al., column 19, lines 54-58; column 21, lines 44-52).

As to claim 15, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the mapping information comprises value-level mapping information that identifies a correlation between at least one of the set of source values of the at least one of the set of source fields and at least one of the set of destination values of the at least one destination field (See Wotring et al., column 9, lines 5-25, lines 35-38).

As to claim 16, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the value-level mapping information is displayed to a user (See Wotring et al., column 9, lines 5-17).

As to claim 17, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the at least one of the set of source values in the value-level mapping comprises a source value combination having the set of source values of a plurality of the at least one of the set of source fields associated with a set of destination values of the at least one of the destination

fields (See Wotring et al., column 9, lines 5-25, lines 35-38; also see Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14, lines 30-36; column 25, lines 24-39).

As to claim 18, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the source value combinations are displayed to a user (See Bliss et al., column 19, lines 54-58).

As to claim 19, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the value-level mapping comprises a destination value combination having a plurality of the set of destination values of the at least one of the destination fields associated with a plurality of the set of source values of the at least one of the set of source fields (See Wotring et al., column 9, lines 5-16, lines 39-60; also see Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14; column 25, lines 24-39).

As to claim 20, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the destination value combinations are displayed to user (See Bliss et al., column 21, lines 44-52).

As to claim 21, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the set of source values of the at least one of the set of source fields in the value-Level mapping comprises a source value combination having values of a plurality of the at least one of the set of source fields and the destination values of the at least one of the destination fields in the value-level mapping comprises a destination value combination having a

plurality of the at least one of the destination fields (See Wotring et al., column 9, lines 5-16, lines 39-60; also see Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14; column 25, lines 24-39).

As to claim 22, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the source value combinations and the destination value combinations are displayed to a user (See Bliss et al., column 19, lines 54-58; column 21, lines 44-52).

As to claim 23, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data comprises type information and the computer program comprises a means for converting the set of source fields from a source type to a destination type based on the type information (See Wotring et al., abstract; column 1, lines 13-18, lines 50-54; column 2, lines 1-9).

As to claim 24, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the type information is displayed to a user (See Wotring et al., abstract; column 1, lines 13-18, lines 50-54; column 2, lines 1-9).

As to claim 25, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data comprises type information for converting the set of source fields from a source type to a destination type based on the type information (See Wotring et al., abstract; column 1, lines 13-18, lines 50-54; column 2, lines 1-9).

As to claim 26, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the computer program is configured to merge the set of source values of the set of source fields into source value combinations comprising a plurality of source values and convert the source value combinations into destination fields of the destination data structure (See Wotring et al., abstract; column 1, lines 13-18, lines 50-54; column 2, lines 1-9; column 9, lines 5-17; also see Bliss et al., column 4, lines 4-14).

As to claim 27, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the source value combinations are displayed to a user (See Bliss et al., column 19, lines 54-58).

As to claim 28, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the computer program is configured to generate hierarchy among the set of source values of the set of source fields into source value hierarchies comprising a plurality of source values and convert the source value hierarchies into destination fields of the destination data structure (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 38-46; column 9, lines 5-17, lines 35-38; also see Bliss et al., column 6, lines 39-43).

As to claim 29, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the source value hierarchies are displayed to a user (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 38-46; column 9, lines 5-17, lines 35-38).

As to claim 30, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data is generated automatically (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 13-18; also see Bliss et al., column 6, lines 39-43).

As to claim 31, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data comprises parsing information and the computer program is configured to execute a means for parsing data values from descriptive fields (See Bliss et al., column 28, lines 60-64).

As to claim 32, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the source data structure comprises descriptive fields having data values and the computer program is configured to use the transformation data to extract the data values from the descriptive fields (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 38-46; column 9, lines 5-17, lines 35-38;column 10, lines 31-38, lines 49-57).

As to claim 33, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the computer program is configured to generate at least one added source field in accordance with the transformation data (See Wotring et al., column 10, lines 49-57).

As to claim 34, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the added source field is displayed to a user (See Wotring et al., column 10, lines 49-57).

As to claims 35-37, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the computer program is configured to generate at least one cloned source field containing a copy of the set of source values in one of the set of source fields in accordance with the transformation data (See Bliss et al., abstract; column 4, lines 53-56); wherein the at least one cloned source field is displayed to a user (See Bliss et al., column 14, lines 33-37); wherein the values of the at least one cloned source field is displayed to a user (See Bliss et al., column 14, lines 33-37).

As to claim 38, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the computer program is configured to generate at least one split-into-hierarchy source field containing a hierarchy based on the set of source values in one of the set of source fields in accordance with the transformation data (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 28-46, lines 49-55; column 5, lines 39-56).

As to claim 39, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the at least one split-into hierarchy source field is displayed to a user (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 28-46, lines 49-55; column 5, lines 39-62; column 8, lines 57-60).

As to claim 40, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the set of source values of the split-into-hierarchy source field are displayed to a user (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 28-46, lines 49-55; column 5, lines 39-62; column 8, lines 57-60).

As to claim 41, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the computer program is configured to generate at least one plurality of split-into-multiple source fields each containing components of the set of source values in one of the set of source fields in accordance with the transformation data (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 28-46, lines 49-55).

As to claim 42, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the plurality of split-into multiple source fields are displayed to a user (See Wotring et al., column 8, lines 57-60).

As to claim 43, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the set of source values of the plurality of split-into-multiple source fields are displayed to a user (See Wotring et al., column 9, lines 5-16).

As to claim 44, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the computer program is configured to extract data values from descriptive fields by identifying the data values within the descriptive fields (See Wotring et al., column 9, lines 5-16), parsing the data values from the descriptive fields (See Bliss et al., column 28, lines 60-64), and populating the at least one new source field with the data values (See Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14).

As to claim 53, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the source data structure comprises a plurality of joined data sources (See Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14, lines 30-48; column 25, lines 24-39).

As to claim 54, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data comprises matching information and the computer program is configured to use the matching information to execute a means for matching the set of source records to the destination records (See Bliss et al., column 3, lines 3-5; column 4, lines 5-14; column 7, lines 31-38).

As to claim 55, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the matching information comprises record-level information identifying the correlation between at least one of the set of source records and at least one of the destination records (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 38-46; and also see Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14; column 7, lines 31-38).

As to claim 56, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the matching information is displayed to a user (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 38-46; and also see Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14; column 7, lines 31-38).

As to claim 57, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the matching information indicates a new destination record is to be created with at least one of the

set of source values from one of the set of source fields from one of the set of source records (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 38-46; and also see Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14; column 7, lines 31-38).

As to claim 58, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the matching information indicates at least one of the destination fields in at least one of the destination records is to be updated with at least one of the set of source values from one of the set of source fields (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 38-46; and also see Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14; column 7, lines 31-38).

As to claim 59, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the matching information indicates at least one destination record is to be replaced with at least one of the set of source records (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 38-46; and also see Bliss et al., column 3, lines 45-52).

As to claim 60, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the computer program is further configured to transform the set of source values in accordance with the transformation data (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 54-61).

As to claim 61, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformed set of source values are displayed to a user (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 54-61; also see Bliss et al., column 19, lines 54-58).

As to claim 62, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the computer program comprises an integrated interface for obtaining the transformation data (See Bliss et al., column 9, lines 34-51; column 10, lines 43-48).

As to claim 63, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the source data structure is represented within the integrated interface as a hierarchy (See Wotring et al., column 2, lines 13-23).

As to claim 64, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the hierarchy comprises a visual representation of the set of source tables (See Wotring et al., column 2, lines 13-23).

As to claim 65, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the hierarchy comprises a visual representation of the set of source fields (See Wotring et al., column 2, lines 13-23).

As to claim 66, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the hierarchy comprises a visual representation of the source table relationships (Wotring et al., column 2, lines 13-23).

As to claim 67, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein a user can define additional relationships between the set of source tables (See Wotring et al., column 2, lines 13-23).

As to claim 68, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the hierarchy comprises a visual representation of the source data values (See Wotring et al., column 2, lines 13-23; column 4, lines 38-46; column 9, lines 5-17, lines 35-38).

As to claim 69, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the destination data structure is represented within the integrated interface as a hierarchy (See Wotring et al., column 2, lines 13-23).

As to claim 70, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the hierarchy comprises a visual representation of the destination tables (Wotring et al., column 1, lines 50-61; column 2, lines 13-23; column 5, lines 39-56).

As to claim 71, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the hierarchy comprises a visual representation of the destination fields (Wotring et al., column 1, lines 50-61; column 2, lines 13-23, lines 25-48).

As to claim 72, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the hierarchy comprises a visual representation of the destination table relationships (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 50-61; column 2, lines 13-23).

As to claim 73, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the hierarchy comprises a visual representation of the destination data values (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 50-61; column 2, lines 13-23; column 4, lines 47-55).

As to claim 74, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the computer program comprises a means for handling exceptions a source field at a time (See Bliss et al., column 19, lines 66-67; column 20, lines 1-4; column28, lines 64-67; column 29, lines 1-2).

As to claim 75, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the computer program is configured to collapse the set of source values within the set of source records down to a set of distinct values within the set of source records (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 54-61; column 4, lines 38-46; also see Bliss et al., column 32-35; column 6, lines 16-19).

As to claim 76, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the set of distinct values is configured to act as a proxy for the set of source values (See Wotring et al.,

column 1, lines 54-61; column 4, lines 38-46, lines 51-55, where "Proxy" is read on "Primary"; also see Bliss et al., column 32-35; column 6, lines 16-19).

As to claim 77, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein each distinct value within the set of distinct values is configured to act as a proxy for all instances of the distinct value across the set of source records (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 54-61; column 4, lines 38-46, lines 51-55, where "Proxy" is read on "Primary"; also see Bliss et al., column 32-35; column 6, lines 16-19).

As to claim 78, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data is applied to the set of distinct values (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 54-61; column 4, lines 38-46, lines 51-55, where "Proxy" is read on "Primary"; column 5, lines 39-53; also see Bliss et al., column 32-35; column 6, lines 16-19).

As to claim 79, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data is applied once to each distinct value rather than once for each instance of the distinct value, and is automatically propagated to each instance of the distinct value (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 54-61; column 4, lines 38-46, lines 51-55, where "Proxy" is read on "Primary"; also see Bliss et al., column 32-35; column 6, lines 16-19).

As to claim 80, Wotring et al. teaches a computer program product (See abstract; column 2, lines 49-51):

obtain the source data structure (See column 2, lines 14-23);

obtain transformation data comprising information associated with the source data structure (column 1, lines 50-57; column 2, lines 14-23, lines 54-60; column 4, lines 10-15, lines 35-44; column 5, lines 39-45);

collapse the set of source values within the set of source records down to a set of distinct values within the set of source records (See column 1, lines 54-61; column 4, lines 38-46);

apply the transformation data to the set of distinct values (See column 1, lines 54-61; column 4, lines 38-46, lines 51-55; column 5, lines 39-53).

Wotring et al. does not teach a computer-usable medium having a computer, program for transforming a source structure to a destination data structure embodied therein, the computer program configured to:

transform the source data structure into the destination data structure.

Bliss et al. teaches a system and method for creating a new data structure in memory populated with data from an existing data structure (See abstract), in which he teaches a computer-usable medium having a computer (See abstract; column 1, lines 14-18; column 3, lines 34-39), program for transforming a source structure to a destination data structure embodied therein (See abstract; column 29, lines 9-12), the computer program configured to: comprising:

transform the source data structure into the destination data structure(See abstract; column 29, lines 9-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Wotring et al., to include a computer-usable medium having a computer, program for transforming a source structure to a destination data structure embodied therein, the computer program configured to: transform the source data structure into the destination data structure.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Wotring et al., by the teachings of Bliss et al. because a computer-usable medium having a computer, program for transforming a source structure to a destination data structure embodied therein, the computer program configured to: transform the source data structure into the destination data structure would efficiently transform the data within the source data structure into formatted data within the field of the destination data structure thereby advantageously preserving the data within the destination data structure (See Bliss et al., column 5, lines 16-20).

As to claim 81, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the source data structure comprises a structured document (See Bliss et al., column 10, lines 12-20).

As to claim 82, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the destination data structure comprises a structured document (See Bliss et al., column 10, lines 12-15, lines 24-27).

As to claim 83, Wotring et al. teaches an apparatus for transforming data (See abstract) comprising:

a first region comprising a source hierarchy representing a source data structure (See column 2, lines 14-23);

a second region comprising a destination hierarchy representing a destination data structure (See column 2, lines 52-55; column 5, lines 39-53).

Wotring et al. does not teach a processor; a memory medium coupled to the processor; the memory medium containing a computer program configured to present a graphical user interface comprising: a third region configured to obtain transformation data associated with the source data structure and destination data structure.

Bliss et al. teaches a system and method for creating a new data structure in memory populated with data from an existing data structure (See abstract), in which he teaches a processor (See column 7, lines 17-21);

a memory medium coupled to the processor (See column 7, lines 17-21, lines 66-67; column 8, lines 1-2);

the memory medium containing a computer program configured to present a graphical user interface (See column 7, lines 17-21) comprising:

a third region configured to obtain transformation data associated with the source data structure and destination data structure (See abstract; column 29, lines 9-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Wotring et al., to include a processor; a memory medium coupled to the processor; the memory medium containing

a computer program configured to present a graphical user interface comprising: a third region configured to obtain transformation data associated with the source data structure and destination data structure.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Wotring et al., by the teachings of Bliss et al. because a processor; a memory medium coupled to the processor; the memory medium containing a computer program configured to present a graphical user interface comprising: a third region configured to obtain transformation data associated with the source data structure and destination data structure would efficiently transform the data within the source data structure into formatted data within the field of the destination data structure thereby advantageously preserving the data within the destination data structure (See Bliss et al., column 5, lines 16-20).

As to claim 84, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data comprises partitioning information (See Wotring et al., column 6, lines 40-47).

As to claim 85, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data comprises field-level mapping information (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 50-54; column 3, lines 21-22, lines 49-57; column 4, lines 10-16; also see Bliss et al., column 15, lines 11-29; column 25, lines 30-34).

As to claim 86, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data comprises value-level mapping information (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 50-54; column 3, lines 21-22, lines 49-57; column 4, lines 10-16; column 9, lines 5-16).

As to claim 87, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data comprises matching information (See Wotring et al., column 4, lines 38-46; and also see Bliss et al., column 4, lines 5-14; column 7, lines 31-38).

As to claim 88, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data comprises type conversion information (See Wotring et al., column 9, lines 35-38).

As to claim 89, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transformation data comprises parsing information (See Bliss et al., column 28, lines 60-64).

As to claim 90, Wotring et al. teaches a computer program product (See abstract; column 2, lines 49-51):

obtain the source data structure (See column 2, lines 14-23);

obtain transformation data comprising information associated with the source data structure (column 1, lines 50-57; column 2, lines 14-23, lines 54-60; column 4, lines 10-15, lines 35-44; column 5, lines 39-45);

collapse the set of source values within the set of source records down to a set of distinct values within the set of source records (See column 1, lines 54-61; column 4, lines 38-46);

wherein each distinct value within the set of distinct values is configured to act as a proxy for instances of the distinct value across the set of source records (See column 1, lines 54-61; column 4, lines 38-46, lines 51-55, where "Proxy" is read on "Primary");

apply the transformation data to the set of distinct values (See column 1, lines 54-61; column 4, lines 38-46, lines 51-55; column 5, lines 39-53).

Wotring et al. does not teach a computer-usable medium having a computer, program for transforming a source structure to a destination data structure embodied therein, the computer program configured to:

transform the source data structure into the destination data structure.

Bliss et al. teaches a system and method for creating a new data structure in memory populated with data from an existing data structure (See abstract), in which he teaches a computer-usable medium having a computer (See abstract; column 1, lines 14-18; column 3, lines 34-39), program for transforming a source structure to a destination data structure embodied therein (See abstract; column 29, lines 9-12), the computer program configured to: comprising:

transform the source data structure into the destination data structure(See abstract; column 29, lines 9-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Wotring et al., to include a computer-usable medium having a computer, program for transforming a source structure to a destination data structure embodied therein, the computer program configured to: transform the source data structure into the destination data structure.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Wotring et al., by the teachings of Bliss et al. because a computer-usable medium having a computer, program for transforming a source structure to a destination data structure embodied therein, the computer program configured to: transform the source data structure into the destination data structure would efficiently transform the data within the source data structure into formatted data within the field of the destination data structure thereby advantageously preserving the data within the destination data structure (See Bliss et al., column 5, lines 16-20).

6. Claims 4 and 45-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wotring et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,677) in view of Bliss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,999,938), as applied to claim 1, 3-44 and 53-90 above, and further in view of Mehr et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,658).

As to claim 4, Wotring et al. as modified, still does not teach wherein the database comprises financial data.

Mehr et al. teaches a computer system and method for managing sales information (See abstract), in which he teaches wherein the database comprises financial data (See column 1, lines 16-21, where "financial data" is read on "financing plans"; also see column 1, lines 64-67; column 2, line 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Wotring et al. as modified, to include wherein the database comprises financial data.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Wotring et al. as modified, by the teachings of Mehr et al. because wherein the database comprises financial data would prevent creating redundant data, thus preventing unnecessary use of data storage resources (See Mehr et al., column 1, lines 29-35).

As to claim 45, Wotring et al. as modified, still does not teach wherein the transformation data comprises measurement information and the computer program uses the measurement information to execute a means for normalizing units of measure within the set of source fields.

Mehr et al. teaches a computer system and method for managing sales information (See abstract), in which he teaches wherein the transformation data comprises measurement information and the computer program uses the measurement information to execute a means for normalizing units of measure within the set of source fields (See column 13, lines 37-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Wotring et al. as modified, to include wherein the transformation data comprises measurement information and the computer program uses the measurement information to execute a means for normalizing units of measure within the set of source fields.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Wotring et al. as modified, by the teachings of Mehr et al. because wherein the transformation data comprises measurement information and the computer program uses the measurement information to execute a means for normalizing units of measure within the set of source fields would enable corporations to store vast amounts of product information in a system (See Mehr et al., column 1, lines 15-25).

As to claim 46, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the measurement information is displayed to a user (See Mehr et al., column 10, lines 27-31; column 13, lines 37-44).

As to claim 47, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the means for normalizing further comprises combining numeric value and the unit of measure from a plurality of source fields (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 57-61; also see Mehr et al., column 1, lines 64-67; column 2, line 1; column 13, lines 37-44).

As to claim 48, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein at least one of the set of source values within the set of source fields comprises an improperly formed measurement value comprising a numeric value and a unit of measure (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 50-61; column 8, lines 61-67; column 9, lines 1-4; also see Mehr et al., column 1, lines 64-67; column 2, line 1; column 13, lines 37-44).

As to claim 49, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the unit of measure comprises an implicit unit of measure associated with the set of source values (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 50-61; column 8, lines 61-67; column 9, lines 1-4; also see Mehr et al., column 1, lines 64-67; column 2, line 1; column 13, lines 37-44).

As to claim 50, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the unit of measure comprises inconsistent string values (See Mehr et al., column 1, lines 64-67; column 2, line 1; column 13, lines 37-44).

As to claim 51, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein the units of measure differ within a plurality of the values within each of the set of source fields (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 50-61; column 8, lines 61-67; column 9, lines 1-4; also see Mehr et al., column 1, lines 64-67; column 2, line 1; column 13, lines 37-44).

As to claim 52, Wotring et al. as modified, teaches wherein computer program is further configured to append the unit of measure to set of source values missing the unit

of measure (See Wotring et al., column 1, lines 50-61; column 8, lines 61-67; column 9, lines 1-4; also see Mehr et al., column 1, lines 64-67; column 2, line 1; column 13, lines 37-44).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to a method and apparatus for transforming data in general:

U.S. Patent No. 6,389,429 to Kane et al. for disclosing a system and method for generating a target database from one or more source databases.

U.S. Patent No. 6,711,624 to Narurkar et al. for disclosing a process of dynamically loading driver interface modules for exchanging data between disparate data hosts.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mellissa M Chojnacki whose telephone number is 730-305-8769. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 703-305-3830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mmc
June 17, 2004

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER